

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/748,084		12/30/2003	Thomas Conrad	30691/MEY5103	6871	
4743	7590	01/24/2006		EXAMINER		
	•	STEIN & BORUN	SAMPLE, DAVID R			
233 S. WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 6300 SEARS TOWER			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
CHICAGO,	IL 606	06		1755		
				DATE MAIL ED. 01/24/2004	DATE MAIL ED: 01/24/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
		10/748,084	CONRAD ET AL.					
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit					
		David Sample	1755					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAISIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 No	ovember 2005.						
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	63 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	ion of Claims							
4)🖂	Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are pending in the application.		•					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-29</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)🛛	☑ Claim(s) <u>30-32</u> is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
Applicati	on Papers	·						
9) 🗆	The specification is objected to by the Examiner	:						
·	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	•						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
-	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).					
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents	• •						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori	·	d in this National Stage					
	application from the International Bureau	, , ,	_					
* 8	See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not receive	d.					
Attachmen	t(s)							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary						
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	te atent Application (PTO-152)					
	r No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	+					

### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of claims 30-32 in the reply filed on November 7, 2005 is acknowledged.

Claims 1-29 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on November 7, 2005.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 30-32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Angeletakis et al. (US 2002/0193462).

Angeletakis et al. discloses a product employed for dental products which includes a ceramic filler having a bimodal particle size distribution. See the abstract. The course powder has a particle size of 0.05-0.5 µm, and the fine powder has an average particle size of less than 100 nm. <u>Id</u>. The composite includes 5-12 vol.% fine powder, and the course particles are employed in an amount of 10-70 vol.%. See page 6, claim 1. These ranges overlap the presently

Page 3

Art Unit: 1755

claimed ranges. Overlapping ranges have been held to establish *prima facie* obviousness. See MPEP 2144.05.

The reference does not disclose the ratio of average particle sizes. However, the course and fine fractions have overlapping ranges with the ranges recited in the present claims, and within these ranges are encompassed the recited ratio of average particle sizes. For example, a ceramic having a course fraction of  $0.5~\mu m$  and fine fraction of 10~nm will have a ratio of 50.

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davidson et al. (US 5,376,442).

Davidson et al. discloses a ceramic membrane formed by sintering a mixture of powders. See the paragraph bridging col's 2 and 3. A fine powder fraction has an average particle size of less than 100 nm, and a course powder fraction has an average particle size of 1-10 µm. Id. The course fraction is contained in an amount of 75-90 wt% with the remainder being the fine fraction. Id. The fine powder fraction has a size that is no more than 0.1 times the size of the course fraction. Id. In other words, the average particle size of the fine fraction is less than 0.1 times the average size of the course fraction, or the ratio of the average size of the course fraction to the fine fraction is at least 10.

Each of the ranges recited in Davidson et al. overlap the range recited in claim 1. Overlapping ranges have been held to establish *prima face* obviousness. MPEP 2144.05.

Art Unit: 1755

## Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Sample whose telephone number is (571)272-1376. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on (572)272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Sample 'Primary Examiner Art Unit 1755